

UNIVERSAL DESIGN COMMITTEE
Division of the State Architect Advisory Board
Final Minutes of Public Meeting
Friday, April 16, 2004

Division of the State Architect Oakland Regional Office
Elihu M. Harris Building, 1515 Clay Street, 2nd Floor, Room 15
Oakland, California

Committee Members Present

John Paul Scott, Chair
Gale Bate
Pete Guisasola
Chris Lawrence
Robert Nicol
Ron Mincer
Mike Modugno
Bob Nicol
Richard Skaff
Amor Taylor
Sharon Toji

Committee Members Absent

Pete Peterson

DSA Staff Present

Stephan Castellanos
Linda Huber
Jim Kerr
Aaron Noble
Dan Rasmussen
Barry Ryan
Elena Tarailo

Others Present

Jim Abrams, CA Hotel & Lodging Assn.
Susan Barnhill, Californians for
Disability Rights
Edward Chandler, DMV
Richard Develder*, DOR
Michael Gibbons, CA Building Standards
Commission (*via teleconference*)
Mark Heimlich, Armor-Tile
Diane Kuypers, CART captioner
Kerwin Lee, Ralph Jenson Associates,
CA Council, AIA
Peter Margen, Margen Associates
Dave Martinez, CALBO
Henry Mustacato, Fibar
Noel Nudeck, Access Today Now
(*via teleconference*)
Michael Paravagna, DOR/DAS

Call to Order and Introductions

Committee Chair John Paul Scott called the meeting to order at 10:15 a.m., and participants took turns introducing themselves. Mr. Scott noted that after the Committee's brief hiatus, some new members have been added to the Universal Design Committee, and the group is now ready to move forward with its assigned tasks.

Committee Focus

State Architect Stephan Castellanos welcomed all Committee members and guests. He said for the past thirty years the State of California has led the way in delivering the highest level of regulatory service and enforcement in protecting the rights of individuals with disabilities. He noted the Universal Design Committee can play an important role in continuing to build on that foundation.

1 Mr. Castellanos stated that one of the most important goals of the Division of the State
2 Architect (DSA) is to also ensure that all state buildings are safe and accessible to
3 everyone through enforcement and developing good building design. He noted the
4 Department of General Services has established a Universal Design Committee to
5 develop appropriate standards and guidelines applicable to state buildings also.

6
7 Mr. Castellanos said the second part of DSA's mission is to develop amendments for a
8 new set of guidelines and building standards for Access in California. He explained that
9 last year the California Building Standards Commission adopted a new model code for
10 California. State agencies are currently in the process of identifying the amendments
11 needed to make that model code meet and exceed California's standards in every area,
12 including provisions for access. Mr. Castellanos noted that Mr. Peter Margen has been
13 working as a consultant with the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) to help
14 DSA achieve that goal. He added that Mr. Aaron Noble will be reviewing DSA's work
15 plan and schedule which will be discussed later in today's meeting.

16
17 Mr. Castellanos noted the Universal Design Committee membership has been
18 expanded to include representatives of all the major interests for individuals with
19 disabilities, and said he is looking forward to working with the reconstituted Committee.

20
21 Mr. Scott provided the Committee with an overview of the DSA Advisory Board staff
22 who serve this Committee and introduced the staff members who were present: Mr.
23 John Vester, interim executive director of the DSA Advisory Board (absent); Mr. Dan
24 Rasmussen, the committee's resource person and administrative assistant, Ms. Elena
25 Tarailo, an advisor on matters of policies and procedures; and Mr. Aaron Noble, who is
26 currently working on code revisions and serves as the Committee's liaison with DSA.

27
28 Mr. Scott noted all Committee members serve at the pleasure of Mr. Castellanos with
29 concurrence of Mr. Lowell Shields, DSA Advisory Board Chair. He said this Committee
30 has been expanded to 12 members, plus Mr. Margen, DSA's code development
31 consultant. He added that Mr. Margen has been working on creating a first draft of the
32 new code.

33
34 Mr. Richard Skaff commented that many members of the disabled community would
35 have preferred to use the more restrictive ANSI code as the basis for California's new
36 access provisions. On the other hand, if Title 24 is used as the base, the more
37 restrictive ANSI and ADAAG provisions need to be added. He recommended clarifying
38 which base code will be used. Mr. Scott said he would be addressing this issue later in
39 the meeting. He emphasized that state law is clear that the provisions of the California
40 Building Code cannot be reduced as stated in the Unruh Act. He added that he had
41 copies of the previous UDC meeting minutes and motions previously approved by the
42 Committee so they could review and clarify the Committee's previous actions.

43
44 Mr. Scott asked the appointed members of the Committee to provide a brief description
45 of their background, area of expertise, and primary interest in serving on the Committee.

46
47 Mr. Gale Bate introduced himself as a code consultant. He said his experience includes
48 consulting on accessibility provisions.

49
50 Mr. Pete Guisasola, City of Rocklin building official, said he was representing the
51 League of California Cities on the Committee. He added that he was also serving on

1 the Committee in charge of certifying access specialists and had previously been a
2 member of the Building Standards Commission.

3
4 Mr. Guisasola stated he's been involved in access issues for a number of years as a
5 building official and a member of the California Building Officials (CALBO). He said he's
6 experienced in both residential and nonresidential access regulations, and added he's
7 always felt that teamwork is a critical component of good building design, plan review,
8 construction, and inspection. He expressed support for the Universal Design concept.

9
10 Mr. Scott asked him if the League of California Cities has any connection with ICBO or
11 other code organizations. Mr. Guisasola responded that the League has no direct
12 connection and clarified that the League consists of local elected officials, police chiefs,
13 and fire chiefs, and people involved in municipal government. He noted the League is
14 involved in a wide range of issues affecting local government including housing,
15 Universal Design, and Access.

16
17 Mr. Chris Lawrence, architect, HMC Architects, said his firm is involved in the design of
18 schools, hospitals, and public buildings. He stated that he has extensive experience in
19 design and construction. Mr. Lawrence commented that he looks forward to learning
20 more from other Committee members about how to incorporate principles of Universal
21 Design in public building projects.

22
23 Mr. Scott added that Mr. Lawrence has been doing research for the Committee on
24 accessibility requirements in areas other than Chapter 11b of the California Building
25 Code. For example, he stated the Department of Occupational Safety and Health has
26 regulations that affect accessibility provisions and noted these requirements need to be
27 coordinated. He said Mr. Lawrence has also been identifying technical issues related to
28 door opening force.

29
30 Mr. Ron Mincer stated that he has been involved with Access Codes for a number of
31 years, both as a consultant and as a consumer, and voiced his concern about whether
32 the gaps in the current Access Code would be filled. He noted consistent enforcement
33 is also a problem.

34
35 Mr. Scott added that Mr. Mincer also serves as the Vice Chair of the Universal Design
36 Committee and was a member of the original Universal Design Advisory Board (UDAB).

37
38 Mr. Mike Modugno, electrical engineer, said most of his work is with architects who
39 design schools, hospitals, and commercial buildings. He noted he has extensive
40 expertise is designing fire alarm systems, including systems for the hearing-impaired.
41 Mr. Modugno expressed an interest in learning more about Access issues.

42
43 Mr. Robert Nicol, architect, stated his primary interest is in designing buildings that are
44 accessible to people who are hearing-impaired.

45
46 Mr. Scott stated that Mr. Pete Peterson who was unable to attend today's meeting due
47 to his school district's budget meetings, is a DSA Advisory Board member and is a
48 licensed architect with Ontario-Montclair School District in Southern California. He
49 noted that the District has secured bond funds to construct and rehabilitate a number of
50 schools. He noted that Mr. Peterson provides valuable administrative skills and the
51 school district's perspective to the Committee.

1 Mr. Scott said he is a licensed architect working as the ADA coordinator for the Port of
2 San Francisco. He noted his expertise lies in the area of federal accessibility
3 regulations and national standards, which extend to a wide range of facilities such as
4 amusement park rides, water parks, play equipment, and wheelchair lifts. He
5 expressed his interest in helping California develop an Accessibility Code that will be
6 certified by the U.S. Department of Justice and become a model code for rest of the
7 United States.

8
9 Mr. Skaff, Deputy Director, Mayor's Office on Disability, City and County of San
10 Francisco, said he initiated the first Access program for San Francisco in 1989 when he
11 served as the City's Chief Building Official. He noted San Francisco was the first city in
12 the U.S. to be sued for having a pattern and practice of nonenforcement of the
13 California Building Code. Mr. Skaff said he also worked as San Francisco's first ADA
14 Coordinator in the Department of Public Works and served on three U.S. Access Board
15 advisory committees focusing on recreation, vessel access, and pedestrian rights-of-
16 way.

17
18 Mr. Skaff noted he was a member of the original UDAB and has been working with Cal
19 OSHA and the State Fire Marshal to enhance the enforcement of the state's evacuation
20 regulations. He pointed out that although California has a law requiring that all people
21 have access to evacuation information, the law is not enforced. As a result, people with
22 vision and hearing impairments do not have the information they need to be able to exit
23 buildings in emergencies.

24
25 Mr. Skaff stated that he is also assisting with the rewriting of Chapter 11B. He said the
26 staff of Housing and Community Development (HCD) is developing three draft
27 ordinances that will be made available to local governments to assure that Universal
28 Design principles are incorporated in residential construction.

29
30 Mr. Scott noted that Mr. Skaff has been in the forefront of addressing some of the most
31 important accessibility issues in the country. He noted Mr. Skaff's work has dealt with
32 recreation facilities, curb ramps, boat docks, play areas, and public rights-of-way.

33
34 Ms. Amor Taylor, Director of Public Policy Services, California Foundation for
35 Independent Living Center (CFILC), said her organization focuses on community
36 education and awareness statewide with regard to Universal Design and construction.
37 She noted CFILC also works to educate policy makers about legislation affecting
38 Universal Design.

39
40 Ms. Sharon Toji, owner of Access Communications, a small consulting firm, said she
41 has been working on disability issues since she was 16 years old. She stated she
42 represented the International Sign Association when the 1998 ANSI standards were
43 written and was one of the three primary authors of the signage standard which became
44 the basis of the new ADAAG. Ms. Toji reported that she was also involved in writing
45 and revising the signage provisions for the California Code and is helping with
46 evacuation and exiting provisions.

47
48 Ms. Toji expressed strong interest in the concept of Universal Design, especially as it
49 relates to signage and way-finding. She noted the state needs to provide clear and
50 easy-to-read signage for people with vision and hearing impairments to ensure efficient
51 building access and exiting.

1
2 Mr. Scott commented that Ms. Toji has been a very important disability advocate at the
3 ANSI Standards Committees and commended and thanked Ms. Toji for her efforts.

4
5 Mr. Skaff noted that Mr. Gene Lozano has declined to join this Committee, and
6 recommended finding someone to represent the blind and vision-impaired community.
7 He also suggested looking for a representative from the cognitive disability community
8 to add to the UDC.

9
10 Mr. Scott said the intent of the UDC is to have representation from all key sectors of the
11 disability community. He asked participants to submit names of possible
12 representatives to the DSA Advisory Board staff.

13
14 Mr. Noel Nudeck suggested that voting members of the UDC provide written summaries
15 of their backgrounds and contact information.

16
17 Ms. Tarailo said the DSA Advisory Board website is presently in the preliminary stages
18 of development, and stated it was conceivable that information such as this could be
19 placed on the website. As one option, she suggested brief biographies and contact
20 information could be placed on the website if acceptable to the UDC members and in
21 keeping with the DSA/DSAAB approval process.

22 23 **Policies and Procedures**

24
25 Mr. Scott noted there was concern that the Universal Design Committee needed to
26 expand to include representatives of major disability constituencies. As a result, the
27 Policies and Procedures Committee of the DSA Advisory Board will review proposed
28 revisions to its existing policies and procedures at its upcoming meeting later this
29 quarter.

30
31 Mr. Scott reviewed some of the basic concepts being considered. He noted the
32 Universal Design Committee will consist of a group of 13 assigned members, one being
33 the special liaison position currently held by Mr. Margen.

34
35 Second, Mr. Scott proposed that the UDC members serve staggered two- and three-
36 year terms to ensure some continuity. He suggested the members draw from a hat at
37 the next UDC meeting to determine which members will serve two-year terms and
38 which will serve for three years.

39
40 In order to keep track of motions made by the UDC, Mr. Scott recommended that all
41 proposed motions be put in writing prior to voting. He asked the members that initiate a
42 motion and second the motion take responsibility for preparing them in writing so all
43 parties clearly understand what is being considered in the motion because it becomes
44 an official action item of the UDC and forwarded by the Committee Chair to the DSA
45 Advisory Board and the State Architect if applicable.

46
47 Mr. Scott noted that at present, the DSA Advisory Board's existing Policies and
48 Procedures specify that 50 percent of each Committee must be Board members. He
49 recommended that provision be changed for the UDC, requiring at least two Board
50 members be present for a quorum.

1 Mr. Scott stated that the Committee members' travel and lodging expenses will be
2 reimbursed by DSA. He noted members need to fill out the proper reimbursement
3 forms to account for their expenses and submit those to DSA. He added that Mr. Dan
4 Rasmussen will review the reimbursement procedures later in the meeting.

5
6 Mr. Skaff said he understood that two DSA Advisory Board members will be assigned to
7 the UDC, and asked whether the other positions on the Committee will be defined
8 according to the constituencies they represent. He also asked how many people with
9 disabilities will be included.

10
11 Mr. Scott responded that after considerable discussion, there was consensus that it
12 would be better to define positions according to constituencies rather than to specify
13 people with certain disabilities. He noted this approach focuses more on what members
14 bring to the table. He suggested thinking in terms of people who represent specific
15 organizations and who are authorized to speak for those groups.

16
17 Mr. Scott observed that the UDC has a specific agenda and task to perform, i.e.,
18 assisting DSA with a new code adoption. He stated that the UDC isn't the only public
19 voice in the code adoption process, and the recommendations of the UDC are only
20 advisory to the DSA AB & DSA. He added that many other groups and individuals will
21 have a say in the ultimate decision-making process.

22
23 Mr. Scott suggested that when the Committee approves any motion that is not
24 unanimous, it's important to articulate all dissenting views so DSA understands the full
25 range of positions and concerns on important issues. Mr. Skaff requested an
26 opportunity for further discussion of this concept at some point in the future.

27
28 In terms of voting privileges, Mr. Scott proposed that all UDC members, including the
29 consultant liaison, should have a voice. He recommended that all members be allowed
30 to vote, except when there are potential conflicts of interest. He noted Committee
31 members should abstain from voting in cases where a decision could have a direct
32 impact on their business relationship with DSA.

33
34 Mr. Scott suggested that the UDC limit their motions to issues of major importance. He
35 added that there may be situations where the Committee members' professional
36 perspective and feedback are sought. In those cases, the members' points of view can
37 be provided to DSA without a formal motion by the UDC.

38
39 Ms. Tarailo said the recommendations concerning the composition of the committee,
40 committee member terms, and the definition of quorum need to go before the DSA
41 Advisory Board's Policies and Procedures Committee, and they forward their
42 recommendations to the full Advisory Board for approval. She added that the next
43 Policies and Procedures Committee meeting is scheduled for May 19.

44
45 Mr. Bate emphasized that the Universal Design Committee's role is limited to advising
46 the DSA Advisory Board, which, in turn, advises DSA. He pointed out that the Board
47 has the discretion to accept or reject any recommendations made by the Committees.
48 In turn, DSA can accept or reject recommendations made by the Board. Mr. Bate noted
49 the Committee should be aware that some of its recommendations may not go forward.

Resource Binders

Mr. Scott said the staff will provide Committee members with a UDC binder to organize meeting materials and make sure members have access to important background documents. He noted the binder will include items such as Chapter 11B, NFPA 5000 Chapter 12, ICC/ANSI A117.1, the latest version of Accessibility Standards used in model building codes, state regulations on playgrounds, and other pertinent materials. He added that complete copies of DSA's compliance manual are available on the DSA website.

Mr. Scott said the staff will also provide Committee members with list of upcoming meeting dates for the DSA Advisory Board, its Committees, and possibly other groups working on issues of interest to the UDC.

Mr. Skaff recommended including a list of Committee members and contact information in the binder.

Mr. Scott noted copies of draft meeting minutes will be sent to Committee members prior to each Committee meeting so they can be reviewed and correct any inaccuracies. He said the final version of each set of Committee minutes will be presented by the Committee Chair for approval during the next meeting of the full Advisory Board.

Mr. Nudeck asked if the documents in the binder could be posted on the DSA web page so they can be accessed by members of the public. Mr. Scott responded that publishing some of the documents creates copyright issues. Mr. Mike Gibbons recommended requesting permission from ICC and ANSI to duplicate their materials.

Travel Expense Reimbursement

Mr. Rasmussen distributed information on travel arrangements and reimbursement procedures. He drew attention to the "travel record sheet" and instructed Committee members to provide trip details on that form. He said Committee members also need to sign the travel expense claim form, and staff will fill in the remaining information. He noted the "paid data record" also needs to be completed in order to issue reimbursement payments.

Mr. Rasmussen requested that Committee members contact Patterson Travel for flight reservations, car rentals, and hotel reservations for UDC meetings using the DSA code number. He noted that when the members notify Patterson, they process refunds when flights are booked or meetings are cancelled.

Mr. Scott asked if the members need to pay for airline tickets in advance. Mr. Rasmussen said no, and noted for streamlining purposes Patterson charges DSA directly for airline reservations.

For those who drive to UDC meetings, Mr. Rasmussen said the state provides reimbursement at the rate of 34 cents per mile, and 37 cents per mile for modified vehicles.

Mr. Rasmussen noted for hotel reservations, Patterson Travel secures room reservations at the state rate, but payment is required by each member upon hotel

1 check in. Following the meeting, members can seek reimbursement from DSA by
2 submitting the necessary reimbursement forms including the hotel receipt. Mr. Bate
3 added that when members notify Patterson Travel that a meeting has been cancelled,
4 Patterson notifies the hotel and processes the cancellation documents.

5
6 Mr. Scott asked Committee members and meeting participants to inform the Advisory
7 Board staff at least five days prior to a meeting if they require a special service or
8 auxiliary aid at meetings. He noted that with sufficient lead time, the staff can arrange
9 for CART captioning, produce documents in Braille or an alternate format, and provide
10 materials on CD-ROM. He noted these requests need to be made separately for each
11 meeting.

12
13 Mr. Scott noted on occasion the Committee will conduct some of its business between
14 meetings via email. He noted that to enhance meeting efficiency, Committee members
15 will be asked to review materials and provide comments in preparation for taking action
16 at Committee meetings.

17
18 Mr. Scott added that the Committee may be creating task groups to work on specific
19 issues and bring their recommendations to the Committee at its next meeting. He
20 invited interested parties to participate in these brainstorming sessions. He noted the
21 staff is compiling a database of interested persons, and he encouraged people to
22 request inclusion on these mailing and distribution lists.

23 24 **DSA Update**

25 26 **ADA Certification**

27
28 Mr. Aaron Noble reported that DSA originally submitted a certification package to the
29 U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) in the fall of 2002, based on the 2001 California
30 Building Code. DOJ indicated in the fall of 2003 that they would issue comments by
31 February of 2004; however, that process has been delayed, and DOJ now expects to
32 release its first package of comments by the end of April.

33
34 Mr. Scott said only four or five states have obtained DOJ certification so far. Mr. Noble
35 commented that processing of the State of Maryland's codes may have delayed DOJ's
36 work on the California package. Mr. Scott noted Maryland went through the first
37 comment iteration stage with DOJ and is now moving into the public hearing phase. He
38 pointed out that even after hearing back from DOJ, the certification process takes a very
39 long time.

40 41 **DSA Workplan: NFPA 5000 Adoption**

42
43 Mr. Noble reviewed a flow chart illustrating the steps in DSA's work plan for adoption of
44 the 2003 NFPA 5000 Building Code and the NFPA 1 Uniform Code. He said four work
45 groups were established by the Building Standards Commission, one on access, one on
46 fire provisions, one on general design, and one on structural provisions. Based on their
47 work, DSA developed a cohesive, detailed work plan identifying all the critical tasks
48 necessary for adoption of the new codes.

49
50 Mr. Noble noted the work plan identifies eight phases, beginning with code development
51 and planning and ending with publication of the new California Building Code. He

1 pointed out the preliminary estimate of the completion date is March, 2007, but that
2 schedule may need to be extended, depending on how much time each phase takes.

3
4 Mr. Noble said DSA is currently in the first phase, code development planning. He
5 noted the second phase is draft amendments, Phase III will be stakeholder review,
6 Phase IV will be rulemaking development, Phase V is review by Building Standards
7 Commission advisory committees, Phase VI is agency rulemaking, Phase VII will be
8 administrative procedures for the Building Standards Commission, and Phase VIII is
9 final publication.

10
11 Mr. Noble said there are already some serious legal issues that have been raised in
12 Phase I concerning use of copyrighted materials. He noted the Department of General
13 Services' legal office is working to resolve those concerns and get the proper
14 agreements in place, but there are currently limitations on DSA's ability to use
15 documents like ICC/ANSI A117.1.

16
17 Mr. Noble pointed out and discussed key phases in the process where the Universal
18 Design Committee could play an important role. In particular, he highlighted the
19 development of a stakeholders and public vetting process in Phase I, development of
20 draft agency amendments in Phase II; the stakeholder/agency review process and the
21 development of a second draft by work groups in Phase III, final stakeholder review in
22 Phase V, and the public hearing process in Phase VII. He noted that extensive fiscal
23 and economic analysis is occurring at the same time.

24
25 Mr. Scott commented that the end result of the entire process should be an inclusive
26 iterative process based on stakeholder consensus and acceptance.

27
28 Mr. Noble said Mr. Margen was hired by NFPA to assist in meshing the NFPA code with
29 the current California amendments, and a draft compilation document will be ready for
30 dissemination in late May or early June.

31
32 Mr. Noble noted that several months ago, the Universal Design Committee asked NFPA
33 to create a matrix showing a side-by-side comparison of the NFPA code with ANSI,
34 ADAAG, the new ADAAG, and the current California amendments. He reported that
35 NFPA recently submitted a matrix that identified equivalent provisions and sections, but
36 it did not provide a comparative, side-by-side analysis. Mr. Noble said the DSA staff
37 found that about 10 to 15 percent of the matrix was incorrect, and another 10 to 15
38 percent of the California amendments were not included at all, so the document has
39 limited usefulness for purposes of comparison.

40
41 Committee members requested copies of the matrix document.

42
43 Mr. Scott clarified that the matrix should be viewed only as a tool, not the guiding
44 document for the development of the first draft of the future code.

45
46 Mr. Skaff said the Committee's intent was to identify which code provisions were the
47 most restrictive. Mr. Noble stated that DSA was interested in more of a side-by-side
48 analysis.

49
50 Mr. Margen introduced himself and said he was uncertain as to his specific role on the
51 Committee, but could seek clarification from NFPA. Mr. Scott informed Mr. Margen that

1 the Committee had earlier discussed the Committee's composition and determined that
2 the liaison should be considered an official voting member of the Committee. He added
3 that all proposed motions will be submitted in writing prior to voting, and the Committee
4 will articulate dissenting opinions along with its recommendations to the DSA Advisory
5 Board, who will forward its recommendations or findings to the State Architect.

6
7 Mr. Modugno asked if the accessibility provisions will be incorporated in Chapter 12 of
8 the NFPA code. Mr. Margen responded that NFPA is not sure yet how to deal with that
9 issue. He noted HCD developed its own rewrite of Chapter 11A, and there may
10 ultimately be a Chapter 12A and Chapter 12B that combines those documents.

11
12 Mr. Noble suggested that Mr. Margen provide an update on his work. Mr. Margen
13 stated that he was charted with taking the accessibility provisions of the California
14 Building Code and moving them into NFPA 5000. He said he understood the Universal
15 Design Committee had recommended using the 2003 ICC/ANSI draft administrative
16 document as the basis of the technical specifications. In response, he noted, NFPA is
17 currently comparing the ICC/ANSI document with the provisions in Chapter 11B, and
18 also with the provisions in Chapter 11A.

19
20 Mr. Margen clarified that there is no intention to replace Title 24 with ANSI. Instead, he
21 said, NFPA is looking at the ANSI document to identify provisions providing greater
22 accessibility.

23
24 Mr. Scott commented that Chapter 12 was unique in the NFPA because it was not
25 developed through the typical committee process. He explained that several
26 committees, such as those dealing with electrical, structural, mechanical, and energy
27 compliance, plus a few people who worked on accessibility, were combined into one
28 committee that drafted the accessibility section.

29
30 He stated that it was unfortunate that no people with disabilities were involved in the
31 process, and the one representative of an organization with disabled constituents quit in
32 protest. Mr. Scott said the end result was that the provisions in Chapter 12 were drafted
33 by the architect who represented the AIA, without input from anyone else. He added
34 that one of the other problems in drafting Chapter 12 was that the provisions could not
35 be copied from ANSI because of copyright issues.

36
37 Ms. Toji commented that the ANSI structure and organization is much clearer and
38 easier to understand than other codes. She said that if nothing else is taken from ANSI,
39 the structure of the document should be used as a basis for drafting the new code. Ms.
40 Toji observed that some sections of ANSI, such as the signage provisions, are more
41 stringent than Title 24, so those provisions should be maintained.

42
43 Mr. Skaff noted that the copyright issue is a major obstacle in using ANSI as a base
44 code. He noted it is more likely California will retain Title 24 building codes and add
45 ANSI and other more restrictive code and regulatory sections to that document.

46
47 Mr. Castellanos commented that DSA's work on the structural area will be hampered
48 unless the Building Standards Commission and NFPA can provide clear assurance to
49 the amending agencies that California has the right to use the language NFPA is
50 providing. He said the attorneys have advised DSA that it should not begin amending
51 base language without that legal clearance.

1
2 Mr. Skaff noted that if the copyright issue cannot be resolved, it may be necessary to go
3 back to the Building Standards Commission and advise them that DSA will not be able
4 to use NFPA and ANSI because of those problems; he added that California may end
5 up adopting the International Building Code (IBC) after all.

6
7 Mr. Scott commented that the California scoping language is still much stronger than
8 either the IBC or the NFPA codes. He noted ANSI did not create the language for the
9 ICC/ANSI A117.1 document; rather, it was created by the U.S. Access Board's
10 committee working on the new ADAAG. Therefore, the copyright actually rests with the
11 U.S. Access Board.

12
13 Mr. Margen said another area of concern is the distinction between Chapters 11A and
14 11B. He recommended that the committee push for publication of a single document to
15 eliminate the confusion.

16
17 Mr. Bate observed that the only way California could avoid this problem would be to
18 write its own code. Otherwise, he noted, California will be forced to use the language in
19 whatever base model code it adopts. Mr. Skaff agreed.

20
21 Mr. Scott said another possibility would be to adopt the U.S. Access Board's language
22 and add more restrictive provisions to that document.

23
24 Mr. Guisasola noted the issue of the usability of Title 24 has been around for many
25 years. He agreed with Mr. Bate and acknowledged that a customized code would avoid
26 useability issues in California.

27
28 At 12:15 p.m., the Committee recessed for lunch. Mr. Scott reconvened the meeting at
29 1:20 p.m.

30 31 **2004 Code Adoption Cycle**

32
33 Mr. Noble noted DSA has an opportunity every year to propose revisions to the
34 California Building Code, and this year's cycle is slated for the beginning of August. He
35 said the staff plans to have a package available for the Committee's review before the
36 next meeting.

37
38 Mr. Scott recommended that Committee members review the materials and submit
39 comments by email.

40
41 Mr. Noble commented that California is currently using the 2001 version of the Building
42 Code. He said the next triennial revision of the building code would normally be held in
43 2004, but with the ongoing transition to the new model code, the Building Standards
44 Commission has not yet indicated whether a triennial revision will take place.

45
46 Mr. Noble noted most of the changes being proposed in this year's annual cycle are
47 minor editorial corrections. He said there are a few substantive changes, including
48 modifications to the design for detectable warnings, elimination of the ½-inch lip at curb
49 ramps, and the effort to operate exterior doors. He stated that DSA will indicate
50 proposed changes to the text and to the graphics. For example, he noted, the figure

1 illustrating detectable warnings will show an in-line pattern of truncated domes rather
2 than a staggered pattern.

3
4 Mr. Skaff asked if the packet will be posted on the DSA Web site so members of the
5 public will have an opportunity to review and comment on the changes. Mr. Noble
6 responded that the changes will be posted.

7
8 Ms. Linda Huber said DSA usually disseminates the proposed revisions for public
9 comment prior to submitting them to the Building Standards Commission. She
10 confirmed that the entire packet will be available for public review.

11
12 Mr. Skaff commented that the elimination of the ½-inch lip does not seem to be a major
13 issue of contention, but issues like the door force and the curb ramp detectable warning
14 may engender more discussion.

15
16 Mr. Noble stated that the Committee will have an opportunity to review the changes
17 before its May 26 meeting, and then the changes will be released for public comment.
18 After the packet is submitted to the Building Standards Commission in August, the
19 Commission will set a date for a public hearing before its Accessibility Committee,
20 probably four or five months later. The changes will come back to the Building
21 Standards Commission for a hearing, and once approved, the effective date will be 180
22 days after the publication date.

23
24 Mr. Castellanos commented that DSA has been paying more attention to notifying the
25 public of meeting dates and inviting comments from interested people. He noted the
26 staff is building a mailing list to ensure that all Committee and Board meetings are
27 widely publicized, and all meeting materials will be made available on the DSA website.

28 29 **Detectable Warning and Directional Surfaces**

30
31 Mr. Noble reported that DSA recently approved Caltrans' plans for revisions to the
32 detectable warning design. He noted Caltrans is planning to adopt the public right-of-
33 way guidelines developed by the U.S. Access Board, except for dimension of the 2-foot
34 warning strip on curb ramps in the direction of travel. Instead, Caltrans is proposing a
35 3-foot warning strip, as recommended by advocates for the blind community and
36 approved by the Universal Design Committee last fall. Mr. Noble clarified that California
37 code specifies "full depth and width," consistent with ADAAG.

38
39 Mr. Skaff expressed concern about California's proposal to require a 3-foot-deep
40 section of truncated domes when the national standard is 2 feet. He acknowledged that
41 3 feet was probably better for detection purposes, but having a conflict in standards
42 could create confusion and lack of consistency. He said the U.S. Access Board's
43 Pedestrian Right-of-Way Committee talked about going to a 3-foot depth but concluded
44 that 2 feet was the minimum necessary for safety. Mr. Skaff added that it took a long
45 time to arrive at a national consensus, and he questioned whether California should
46 establish a different standard.

47
48 Mr. Noble stated that the issue was discussed extensively by the Universal Design
49 Committee at its September 25 meeting, and the result was a recommendation to use 3
50 feet instead. DSA then decided to move forward in its rulemaking process to adopt the
51 3-foot dimension instead of the full depth of the ramp.

1
2 Committee members discussed whether California should require yellow on curb ramps.
3 Mr. Noble clarified that HCD requires yellow on curb ramps in housing construction, but
4 yellow is not required for curb ramps in commercial construction. He said DSA is
5 currently in the process of evaluating products for certification, and an ad hoc committee
6 will be established to look at this issue. He noted Underwriters Laboratories (UL)
7 submitted a proposal for developing a test standard to evaluate various aspects of
8 materials, including color fastness, so the issue may come up as part of that process.

9
10 Mr. Margen noted yellow was specified in the 1994 edition of the code, but it may have
11 been inadvertently dropped from the 1998 version. He added that the blind and low-
12 vision communities were adamant that yellow should be required.

13
14 Mr. Noble said other proposed revisions in the annual code change packet include an
15 in-line pattern rather than a staggered pattern, and specifications for dome spacing and
16 dome size consistent with the public right-of-way guidelines.

17
18 Mr. Noble noted AB 685, approved in 1999, directs DSA to work with stakeholders to
19 develop recommendations for a test standard to evaluate detectable warnings for color
20 fastness, durability, attachment, and resilience. He said UL's proposal identifies a
21 number of groups that should be represented on the ad hoc committee, and DSA has
22 begun developing a list of interested parties who will be invited to participate. He added
23 that UL's role will be limited to providing scientific and laboratory support for the effort.
24 Mr. Castellanos suggested that the Universal Design Committee consider forming a
25 task group to assist DSA in this process.

26
27 Mr. Margen asked if the ad hoc committee will also be looking at placement of
28 detectable warnings. Mr. Noble responded that the Committee's primary focus will be
29 on developing a test standard, so the issue of placement may not come up. Mr.
30 Castellanos observed that placement will need to be addressed at some point to clarify
31 the confusion about when, where, and how much detectable warning material is
32 required.

33
34 Mr. Skaff commented that there are some widely accepted standardized tests that are
35 used to evaluate durability, color-fastness, strength, slip resistance, and sound quality
36 when tapped with a cane or feet. He suggested that the Committee consider using
37 existing tests whenever possible to avoid duplication of efforts.

38
39 Mr. Skaff asked if the new guidelines have anything to do with directionality of curb
40 ramps at curb returns. Mr. Noble stated that the committee may eventually branch off to
41 discuss these more peripheral issues, but its main purpose is to provide a
42 recommendation of a test standard for the materials. In terms of testing, Mr. Noble
43 pointed out that AB 685 actually contains some unique specifications, so there may not
44 be tests that evaluate those particular characteristics.

45
46 Mr. Scott asked for clarification about the next steps in the process. Mr. Noble said that
47 under the terms of the contract, UL will facilitate establishment of the ad hoc Committee,
48 and DSA is currently working with UL to identify stakeholders that should be included.
49 Mr. Castellanos said he envisions the Universal Design Committee as being the
50 convener and organizer of the public sessions; he also welcomed input from the
51 Committee as to who should be included on the ad hoc committee.

New DSA Policies

Mr. Noble reported that DSA recently hired five more people to assist in reviewing policies. He said the staff is currently looking at all policies to identify those needing revision, those that should be eliminated, and areas where new policies would be helpful. He noted several new policies are being reviewed internally by the staff and will be ready for the Committee's feedback prior to the next meeting.

Mr. Nudeck recommended posting the proposed revisions on the web page so the public can review and comment on them also.

Mr. Noble expressed his opinion that the Universal Design Committee should be the forum for vetting new policies and policy changes. Mr. Scott noted this information will be posted on the website and made available to the public. He noted the importance of posting documents in an accessible format on the website.

SB 1242 - Braille

Mr. Noble noted SB 1242 directed the State Architect to develop regulations to ensure proper Braille and tactile signage in buildings. He said various amendments were added as the bill made its way through the legislature, and he drew attention to the chronological summary prepared by staff.

Ms. Toji commented that the bill as originally written applied to both privately and publicly funded buildings. She said the original concept was to require building owners to present a proposed signage package in order to obtain a certificate of occupancy. However, over the course of negotiating with the building industry, the proponents narrowed the scope to apply only to publicly funded buildings, in exchange for funding to train building inspectors, architects, and plan checkers. Ms. Toji noted the hope was that signage programs would eventually begin to move into privately funded buildings. She added that AB 1242 does not add any new requirements to those already in the California Building Code.

Mr. Jim Abrams, California Hotel and Lodging Association, expressed concern about adopting regulations that would be apply retroactively. Ms. Toji clarified that the intent of AB 1242 was only to find a vehicle to encourage development of signage programs.

Mr. Noble added that some of the language in the bill might be usable in terms of future code provisions.

Mr. Scott noted he asked DSA staff, when referring issues to the Committee, to provide a cover memo explaining the topic and its background, the action requested of the Committee, and a deadline.

UDC Update

Mr. Scott said the Committee formed three task groups at the last meeting: one on play areas, one on door opening force, and a steering committee, which has not yet been activated. He noted the Committee also discussed forming a group to assist DSA with merging Chapter 11B with NFPA 5000 Chapter 12 and ICC/ANSI A117.1.

1
2 Mr. Skaff suggested offering new members of the Committee an opportunity to
3 participate on the tasks groups that interest them.

4
5 Mr. Scott requested that the staff create a sign-up list for each task group.

6 7 **Play Area Surfaces**

8
9 Mr. Scott noted Mr. Richard Skaff brought this issue to the Committee's attention, and
10 Mr. Pete Peterson was asked to chair this task group. He said the Committee identified
11 three key issues for consideration by the task group: 1) durability and maintainability of
12 accessible route material, especially within the fall zone; 2) areas where state
13 regulations need to be update and improved; and 3) training for DSA inspectors and
14 plan-checkers on appropriate play area safety and accessibility standards.

15
16 Mr. Skaff proposed adding a fourth issue, the adequacy of the U.S. Access Board's
17 Playground Subcommittee's proposed guidelines. Mr. Scott commented that the
18 guidelines are less protective than earlier iterations, and they leave serious gaps in
19 terms of aquatic play elements, play environments, and attraction environments. Mr.
20 Skaff said overhanging obstructions also need to be addressed.

21
22 Mr. Nudeck volunteered to join the task groups looking at play area issues and door
23 opening force.

24
25 Mr. Nudeck asked if the play area task group will be looking at play surfaces accessible
26 for wheelchairs. He recommended considering ramps with level surfaces and no steps
27 to help playground users in wheelchairs gain access to aerial equipment.

28
29 Mr. Skaff noted ramps were originally included in the U.S. Access Board's proposed
30 guidelines, but the provisions were later changed to require ramps only for play areas
31 with 20 or more play experiences. He added that he was not aware of any schools or
32 cities with play areas that fit this definition.

33
34 Mr. Scott observed that the guidelines permit transfer tiers, but they do not address the
35 need for putting play equipment within reach of kids in wheelchairs.

36
37 Mr. Margen suggested that the play area group also look at the issue of toxicity and
38 microbial activity in play area surfaces. He noted loose material, such as engineered
39 wood products, can be a problem for people with respiratory issues.

40
41 Mr. Scott commented that fecal contamination is a major concern for play areas that
42 have sand or water features. He observed that this issue goes beyond accessibility
43 concerns and could be more appropriately addressed by health care officials.

44
45 ***Mr. Scott reviewed the members of the Play Area Task Group: Pete***
46 ***Peterson, Chair; Richard Skaff, Noel Nudeck, Henry Mustacato, Ron Mincer, and***
47 ***Pete Guisasola. Committee members proposed adding Dr. Fran Wallach.***

48 49 **Door Opening Force**

1 ***Committee members discussed the composition of the Door Opening Task***
2 ***Group. Mr. Scott identified the following participants: Chris Lawrence, Chair;***
3 ***Richard Skaff, Noel Nudeck, Jim Abrams, Ron Mincer, Bob Nicol, Donn Harter,***
4 ***Peter Margen, Susan Barnhill, and Terrel Terry.***
5

6 Mr. Lawrence distributed an outline of salient points to be addressed by the Door
7 Opening Force Task Group. He said key issues include use of automatic doors, criteria
8 for requiring automatic doors, placement and spacing, and signage. He welcomed
9 feedback from Committee members.

10
11 Mr. Scott asked Committee members to review the materials from the task group and
12 submit commits by e mail.

13
14 He noted that after the next meeting, the two chairs will compile information for
15 dissemination and set up an electronic workshop session.

16
17 Mr. Bate pointed out there may be legal problems with holding electronic workshops.
18 Mr. Castellanos said the staff is looking into the feasibility of electronic meetings.

19
20 Mr. Gibbons recommended inserting clarifying language in the code explaining how
21 door opening pressure is to be measured. He noted there is currently a great deal of
22 confusion about whether to measure at the moment arm or at the end, so clear direction
23 needs to be provided.

24 25 **Engineered Wood Fiber Video**

26
27 Mr. Henry Mustacato, Fiber, showed a short video about the use of engineered wood
28 fiber for accessible play areas at a school in Springfield, Missouri. He provided
29 committee members with written copies of the narrative.

30
31 Committee members watched the video presentation.

32
33 Mr. Skaff thanked Mr. Mustacato and requested a copy of the video.

34
35 Mr. Skaff questioned the background of the narrator and said she appeared to be
36 endorsing Fibar particularly. He noted none of the children talked about the differences
37 in functionality and the level of effort it took to propel themselves across hard solid
38 surfaces, rubber tiles, and engineered wood fiber surface.

39
40 Mr. Skaff commented that movement of material is a major problem with all loose fill
41 materials. He noted loose surfaces need to be maintained constantly in provide a firm
42 and stable surface and a proper height relationship between the equipment and the
43 ground. He said that when he visits play areas with loose surfaces, he sees deep divots
44 under play equipment, and transfer locations are not available unless the material is
45 constantly relocated and recompacted to provide an accessible surface. Mr. Skaff
46 acknowledged that loose materials may work satisfactorily for fall zones, but not for
47 paths of travel. He described his own experience trying to maneuver and propel a
48 wheelchair over an engineered wood fiber surface in a play area.

49
50 Mr. Scott suggested that in addition to accessible routes, the task group should look at
51 the new 1487 standards for play equipment and materials. He noted there are updated

standards for different types of playground equipment, such as hanging ropes and chains, netting, foam, and water features.

Mr. Skaff observed that the state-certified playground inspectors should be looking at both safety and accessibility issues.

Mr. Bate recommended including someone on the task group representing city public parks and recreation facilities. Mr. Scott suggested inviting people from the hotel industry, the recreation and amusement industry, and schools.

Mr. Mincer reported that he checked into engineered wood products about ten years ago and came to the same conclusion as Mr. Skaff, that loose materials are not accessible for people in wheelchairs.

Mr. Abrams noted many hotels offer playgrounds and daycare facilities to guests. He said the Department of Social Services has licensure and regulatory authority over all daycare centers in the state, and he suggested including them in the mix.

Mr. Scott encouraged committee members to provide the staff with the names of other interested parties. He noted DSA is interested in gathering feedback from as many people as possible.

Mr. Scott clarified that the Universal Design Committee will not be responsible for writing Code. He clarified that the role of the UDC and its task groups will be to focus on recommending performance criteria to the DSA AB and DSA, and staff will write the Code. He encouraged the task groups to brainstorm and bring key issues before the full Committee.

Mr. Mincer commented that it would be helpful for members of the Committee to visit play areas to see the surfaces for themselves and Mr. Scott agreed.

Review of Previous Committee Motions

Mr. Scott drew attention to Ms. Tarailo's compilation of previous motions passed by the Committee since its first meeting on July 31, 2003, comprised of a list of follow-up and action items from past UDC meetings. Mr. Scott proposed that the Committee review the list and decide at the next meeting which items should be reaffirmed, modified, or rejected.

Mr. Scott observed that the diagram at the top of the document shows the relationship of the Committee to the Advisory Board and DSA. He then reviewed the Committee's mission statement and priorities.

Mr. Scott noted the Committee approved a motion to recommend use of NFPA Chapter 12 and the ICC/ANSI A117.1 standard, rather than Title 24, as the basis of California's access provisions. Mr. Skaff commented that the motion was actually the other way around. Mr. Scott said the motion was later clarified to express the intention of migrating Title 24 into the other standards. However, after that, the Committee recommended that the scoping requirements for accessibility be based on Chapter 11B, with the NFPA materials migrated into that, and that the technical requirements for

1 accessibility be based on ICC/ANSI A117.1, with Chapter 11B technical requirements
2 migrated into that.

3
4 Mr. Scott said the Committee also passed a motion regarding materials for play area
5 surfaces, and noted that motion was later amended to incorporate the seven principles
6 of Universal Design, delete the specific reference to engineered wood fiber, and define
7 the criteria of “firm and stable” and maintainability instead.

8
9 Ms. Tarailo noted the list of follow-up items was derived from the UDC minutes of the
10 July 31, August 28, September 25, and November 5 meetings.

11
12 Mr. Scott once again requested that Committee members review these lists and be
13 prepared to revisit the motions at the next UDC meeting.

14
15 **New Business**

16
17 Mr. Kerwin Lee asked whether the Universal Design Committee is the appropriate forum
18 for brining up new code changes.

19
20 Mr. Scott recommended that the Committee confine its role to making policy
21 recommendations and brainstorming to assist DSA with the pending DOJ certification
22 process and the model code merger.

23
24 Mr. Castellanos advised Mr. Lee to submit a petition for a code change on the form
25 available on DSA’s Web site. Ms. Huber said the administrative regulations in Part I of
26 the building standards law spells out the criteria for what should be included in a code
27 change petition.

28
29 Ms. Taylor asked if the Committee follows other bills that could impact accessibility.
30 She noted there is pending legislation regarding grab bars in hotel rooms that might be
31 of interest to DSA.

32
33 Mr. Abrams said the Hotel and Lodging Association talked with the author’s staff and
34 recommended a broader focus for the bill. Instead of just addressing grab bars and
35 nonslip surfaces, the Association suggested addressing all issues related to Universal
36 Design. Mr. Abrams added that he informed the author’s staff about the existence of
37 the Universal Design Committee. He then noted the author later withdrew the bill.

38
39 Mr. Scott said he would discuss the possibility of forming another task group to look at
40 grab bars and related issues with Board Chair Lowell Shields.

41
42 Mr. Bate recommended that the Committee limit itself to legislative issues referred to it
43 by the State Architect. Mr. Castellanos noted a staff person from the Department of
44 General Services is assigned to work with DSA on legislation. He noted there are many
45 spot bills being considered by the legislature that are likely to change substantially
46 before they reach their final form. He agreed with Mr. Bate that it would be better for the
47 Committee to wait until specific issues emerge. Mr. Castellanos added that a member
48 of his staff tracks bills relating to Access.

49
50 Mr. Skaff questioned the advisory relationship of the Universal Design Committee to the
51 DSA Advisory Board and the State Architect. He noted the DSA Advisory Board was

1 specifically created to deal with school projects, so the concerns of the Board may differ
2 from those of the Committee. Mr. Skaff expressed his opinion that the Committee
3 should have direct access to the State Architect rather than having to go through the
4 Board.

5
6 Mr. Castellanos clarified that the creation of the DSA Advisory Board and its
7 Committees was authorized by regulations that give DSA broad authority to create
8 advisory groups for any purpose. He noted that over the past four years, DSA has been
9 working to redefine the role of the State Architect as a policy organization and a
10 regulatory body, in addition to being a plan review body for public schools and public
11 buildings. He said the regulatory package currently being reviewed by the Department
12 of General Services includes provisions that separate the school plan review function
13 from its policy and regulatory role.

14
15 Mr. Castellanos expressed his opinion that DSA needs to do more work to spell out
16 DSA's role in greater depth. He stated that he's had serious concerns regarding the
17 future of the accessibility program because funding for this program is provided solely
18 through plan review fees. He noted that if DSA loses its plan review function, the
19 Accessibility Program could be jeopardized.

20
21 Mr. Skaff suggested that the Committee assist DSA to develop an interpretive manual
22 that not only deals with schools and state buildings, but also gives regulatory authority
23 to DSA to interpret the code provisions DSA writes. He observed that another key issue
24 related to accessibility of schools is finding a funding source to pay for access
25 improvements in new school construction and remodeling projects.

26
27 Mr. Castellanos noted there is a pending bill that would require the state to provide
28 sufficient resources to pay for access upgrades to state schools. He offered to provide
29 Committee members with a copy of that bill.

30
31 Mr. Margen commented that in developing an interpretive manual, it would be helpful to
32 have a statement explaining the intent and applicability of various regulations. He noted
33 there are some situations where things are done a certain way because of past practice,
34 but people have little understanding of the rationale and history behind the state's
35 requirements.

36
37 Mr. Castellanos said that at the next meeting, the staff will provide a briefing on DSA's
38 approach to developing an interpretive program. He welcomed input from committee
39 members and industry representatives on what end users might find beneficial.

40
41 Committee members expressed support for the idea of maintaining monographs on
42 code changes to provide a historical record.

43 44 **Next Meeting**

45
46 Mr. Scott announced that the next Committee meeting was scheduled for May 26, 2004,
47 and he suggested choosing a location. He proposed alternating between Sacramento
48 and regional offices. Committee members agreed to hold the May 26 meeting in
49 Sacramento.

1 Mr. Scott said he asked the staff to look into the possibility of obtaining speakers and
2 teleconferencing equipment to improve the sound quality in meeting rooms for UDC
3 meetings.

4
5 Mr. Nudeck suggested meeting in San Diego County.

6
7 Ms. Tarailo stated that she was in the process of compiling a list of possible meeting
8 sites with teleconferencing facilities. She said some school district offices might be
9 good candidates.

10
11 Mr. Skaff asked about meeting at city sites with playgrounds and recreation facilities.
12 Mr. Scott added that the Port of San Francisco has good conference facilities. Ms.
13 Tarailo invited participants to send her the names of contact people and suggested
14 meeting locations.

15
16 Mr. Skaff requested that the staff provide information on accessible public transportation
17 to meeting sites, accessible parking, and accessible restrooms.

18
19 **Adjournment**

20 Mr. Scott thanked committee members and guests for their participation.

21
22 There being no further business, a motion was made and seconded that the meeting be
23 adjourned. The meeting of the Universal Design Committee was adjourned at 3:15 p.m.

24
25 **Follow Up Items (discussed; no motions passed)**

- 26
27 1. UDC members to draw from a hat during the next UDC meeting to determine
28 which members will serve two-year terms and which will serve three year terms.
29
30 2. To keep track of motions, Mr. Scott proposed that all motions being considered
31 be put in writing prior to voting. (The members that make a motion and second
32 the motion would be responsible for preparing them in writing so all parties
33 clearly understand what is being considered for action).
34
35 3. At Mr. Scott suggestion re: when the UDC approves a motion that's not
36 unanimous, it's important to articulate all dissenting views so DSA understands
37 the full range of positions and concerns on important issues, Mr. Skaff requested
38 an opportunity for further discussion of this concept at some point in the future.
39
40 4. Mr. Scott said the staff will provide each Committee member with a binder to
41 organize meeting materials and ensure members have access to important
42 background documents. He noted the binder will include items such as Chapter
43 11B, NFPA 5000 Chapter 12, ICC/ANSI A117.1, the latest version of accessibility
44 standards used in model building codes, state regulations on playgrounds, and
45 other pertinent materials.
46
47 5. Mr. Scott said the staff will also provide Committee members with a list of
48 upcoming meeting dates for the DSA Advisory Board, its Committees, and
49 possibly other groups working on issues of interest to the Committee.
50

- 1 6. Mr. Skaff recommended including a list of Committee members and contact
2 information in the binder.
3
- 4 7. Mr. Scott noted copies of draft meeting minutes will be sent to Committee
5 members prior to the meetings so they can review them and identify
6 inaccuracies. He said the final version of each set of minutes will be discussed
7 and approved at the following Board meeting.
8
- 9 8. Mr. Noble stated Mr. Margen is assisting with meshing the NFPA code with the
10 current California amendments, and noted a draft compilation document will be
11 ready for dissemination in late May or early June. Mr. Noble noted that at the
12 UDC's request, NFPA was asked to create a matrix showing a side-by-side
13 comparison of the NFPA code with ANSI, ADAAG, the new ADAAG, and the
14 current California amendments. He stated that NFPA recently submitted a matrix
15 that identified equivalent provisions and sections, but it did not provide a
16 comparative, side-by-side analysis.
17
- 18 Mr. Noble said the DSA staff found that about 10 to 15 percent of the matrix was
19 incorrect, and another 10 to 15 percent of the California amendments were not
20 included, so the document has limited usefulness for purposes of
21 comparison. Committee members requested copies of the matrix document.
22
- 23 9. Mr. Noble noted that DSA will propose revisions to the California Building Code
24 during this year's cycle, which is slated for the beginning of August. He said the
25 staff plans to have a package available for the Committee's review prior to the
26 next meeting. Mr. Scott recommended that Committee members review the
27 materials and submit their comments by e mail.
28
- 29 10. Mr. Noble noted most proposed changes in this package are minor editorial
30 corrections with a few substantive changes, including modifications to the design
31 for detectable warnings, elimination of the ½-inch lip at curb ramps, and the effort
32 to operate exterior doors. He stated that DSA will indicate proposed changes to
33 the text and to the graphics. The package of proposed changes will be posted
34 on the DSA website, and DSA will disseminate the proposed revisions for public
35 review and comment prior to submitting them to the Building Standards
36 Commission.
37
- 38 11. Mr. Mincer commented that it would be helpful for members of the Committee to
39 visit play areas to see the surfaces for themselves.
40
- 41 12. Mr. Noble noted several new policies are currently being reviewed by DSA
42 technical staff and will be ready for the Committee's feedback prior to the next
43 meeting.
44
- 45 13. Mr. Nudeck asked if the documents in the binder could be posted on the DSA
46 web page so they can be accessed by members of the public. Mr. Scott
47 responded that publishing some of the documents creates copyright issues.
48
- 49 14. Mr. Mike Gibbons recommended requesting permission from ICC and ANSI to
50 duplicate their materials.
51

- 1 15. Mr. Noble noted AB 685, approved in 1999, directs DSA to work with
2 stakeholders to develop recommendations for a test standard to evaluate
3 detectable warnings for color fastness, durability, attachment, and resilience. He
4 said UL's proposal identifies a number of groups that should be represented on
5 the ad hoc committee, and DSA has begun developing a list of interested parties
6 who will be invited to participate. He added that UL's role will be limited to
7 providing scientific and laboratory support. Mr. Castellanos suggested that the
8 Universal Design Committee consider forming a task group to assist DSA in this
9 process.
- 10
11 Mr. Castellanos said he envisions the Universal Design Committee as being the
12 convener and organizer of the public sessions; he also welcomed input from the
13 Committee as to who should be included on the ad hoc committee.
- 14
15 16. Mr. Scott proposed that the Committee review the list of action items and follow
16 up items for the UDC meetings since July 2003 and decide at the next UDC
17 meeting if they should be reaffirmed, modified, or rejected.
- 18
19 17. Mr. Scott asked Committee members and meeting participants to inform the
20 Advisory Board staff at least five days prior to a meeting if they require a special
21 service or auxiliary aid at meetings. The staff can arrange for CART captioning,
22 produce documents in Braille or an alternate format, and provide materials on
23 CD-ROM. He noted the requests must be made separately for each meeting.
- 24
25 18. Mr. Scott noted he asked DSA staff, when referring issues to the Committee, to
26 provide a cover memo explaining the topic and its background, action requested
27 of the Committee, and a deadline.
- 28
29 19. Following Mr. Skaff's suggestion to offer new Committee members an
30 opportunity to participate on the tasks groups that interest them, Mr. Scott
31 requested that the staff create a sign-up list for each task group.
- 32
33 20. Mr. Castellanos noted there's a pending bill that would require the state to
34 provide sufficient resources to pay for access upgrades to state schools. He
35 offered to provide Committee members with a copy of the bill.
- 36
37 21. Mr. Margen commented that in developing an interpretive manual, it would be
38 helpful to have a statement explaining the intent and applicability of various
39 regulations. He noted there are some situations where things are done a certain
40 way because of past practice, but people have little understanding of the
41 rationale and history behind the state's requirements. Mr. Castellanos said that
42 at the next meeting, the staff will provide a briefing on DSA's approach to
43 developing an interpretive program, and welcomed input from Committee
44 members and industry representatives on what end users might find beneficial.
- 45
46 22. Committee members expressed support for the idea of maintaining monographs
47 on code changes to provide a historical record.
- 48
49 23. Mr. Scott asked Committee members to review the materials from the Door
50 Opening Force task group and submit commits by e mail, noting that after the
51 next meeting, the chairs of the 2 task groups (Play areas and Door Opening

1 Force) will compile information for dissemination and set up an electronic
2 workshop session. With that, Mr. Bate pointed out there may be legal problems
3 with holding electronic workshops. Mr. Castellanos said the staff is looking into
4 the feasibility of electronic meetings.
5

6 24. Mr. Scott asked the staff to look into the possibility of obtaining speakers and
7 teleconferencing equipment to improve the sound quality for UDC meetings.
8

9 25. Ms. Tarilo stated that staff is in the process of compiling a list of possible
10 meeting sites with teleconferencing facilities, and noted some school district
11 offices may be good candidates. Mr. Skaff asked about meeting at city sites with
12 playgrounds and recreation facilities. Mr. Scott noted the Port of San Francisco
13 has good conference facilities. Ms. Tarilo invited participants to send her the
14 names of contact people and suggested meeting locations.
15

16 26. Mr. Skaff requested that the staff provide information on accessible public
17 transportation to meeting sites, accessible parking, and accessible restrooms.
18
19

20 Respectfully Submitted,
21
22
23
24

25 John Vester
26 Interim Executive Director